

ATTACHMENT 2: *Comments on Six Questions Contained in Previous Memo*

*Question 1:* The basic claims made for remote viewing and PK are technically, of course, that both exist and can be demonstrated with some measure of reliability. Claims also pertain to the distance over which remote viewing takes place, its noisy characteristics, and its presence in virtually all persons. As a practical matter, many of these claims are not valid as judged from the *experimental* data, yet appear to be substantiated from anecdotal data. I am less familiar with the PK claims, and will accordingly not address those. See, however, my statements of the review of remote viewing literature in a later section of the black notebook. Operationally, the claims are not nearly as extraordinary. Although some operational people are confirmed skeptics, others are obviously believers, and feel that there is some intelligence value to the remote viewing and PK activities. Some persons have gone so far as to claim that the Soviets can in fact use PK on a long distance basis to inflict substantial damage to strategic and tactical warfare equipments. These claims are unsubstantiated, yet believed by some.

*Question 2:* Very few *reliable* data exist to support these claims. As indicated above and in my analysis of the SRI activities, the "data" are subject to experimental flaws in most cases and should be treated cautiously. On the other hand, the rejection of such claims is not a simple matter because of the statistical implications of doing an experiment necessary to disprove the existence of a phenomenon. Such an experiment is by definition a critical one, yet clearly must also be treated in a probabilistic sense. Thus, very few scientists would lay

claim to being able to conduct an experiment designed to disprove the existence of anything.

*Question 3:* This question is almost too broad to answer. Clearly, the first form of experimentation that is required is that of a controlled nature, not one subject to the fancies of contract monitors, ranking officers, and key political figures. Rather, a long-range experimental plan, clearly stating hypotheses to be tested and procedures to be followed, is required before any experimentation should be supported or undertaken. I do not consider the AMSAA work to be of this programmatic and planned nature. That is not to say that there is insufficient evidence to justify such research being done; rather, there is sufficient preliminary evidence to justify a future planned program, but not continued exploration of targets of opportunity.

*Question 4:* The basic mechanisms underlying RV and PK phenomena are certainly not agreed upon, and are probably largely undefined. The so-called tests which have been conducted are of limited scientific value and have been conducted under limited scientific control. Again, a programmatic plan acceptable to scientists before the conduct of the experiment is necessary, rather than a description of how the test was conducted after the fact. The existing SRI protocol, for example, is totally insufficient in detail to serve as a model for conduct of such a program.

*Question 5:* Assuming the scientific claims are somewhat valid, then one should conduct controlled operational experiments much as one might conduct controlled laboratory experiments. That is, meaningful content of a form unknown to the experimenters and the viewer should be

established by an intelligence agency, so that the response can be scored objectively against that content. Thus, one should be able to directly compare essential elements of information in a remote viewing protocol and transcript much as one evaluates essential elements of information in a photographic transcription. In order to make any comparison with other operational techniques, common information element<sup>3</sup><sub>A</sub> must be directly compared in terms of accuracy, completeness, and false information.

*Question 6:* The relative importance of many of the steps used in these experiments is questionable, and perhaps justified only by the claims of the experimenters who have developed the research protocols. See my detailed question and answer discussion in the black book for some details. Others are contained in the report described in previous meetings. Certainly, based upon the existing experimental evidence, it is impossible to tell exactly and to what extent each of the steps in the experimental procedures produces the claimed positive results.